

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/564,166	Applicant(s) BERDINI ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1626	

All Participants:

(1) Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D. {USPTO}.

(2) Erica M. Hines, Esq. (Reg. No. 65,765).

Date of Interview: 24 February 2011

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: 80

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 11:29am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
82, 83 and 112

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The Examiner called Applicant's representative and left a voice mail message detailing corrections which needed to be made to claims 82, 83 and 112 to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Ms. Hines called the Examiner at 12:05pm of same day to discuss the recommended changes to the claims. It was agreed that the Examiner would fax a draft copy of the Examiner's amendment to Ms. Hines for approval because of the numerous changes suggested to instant claim 82. Ms. Hines called the Examiner @1:25pm of same day and left a voice mail message giving the Examiner approval of the Examiner's Amendment.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Laura L. Stockton/

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)